



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

m-f

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,213	08/27/2003	Fred Bagshaw	H310765US	4338

28079 7590 10/13/2006

GOWLING, LAFLEUR HENDERSON LLP
ONE MAIN STREET WEST
HAMILTON, ON L8P 4Z5
CANADA

EXAMINER

CHIN SHUE, ALVIN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3634

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/648,213

Applicant(s)

BAGSHAW, FRED

Examiner

Alvin C. Chin-Shue

Art Unit

3634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.

- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 9.14.66
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heilskov '628 in view of Henley. Heilskov shows a step/platform at 12 and heat shrink plastic stop sleeving 18,19. Henley shows heat shrunk stop sleeve made of thermo plastic material. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use thermoplastic material, for the plastic heat shrunk sleeves of Heilskov, as taught by Henley, to facilitate shrinking.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heilskov '708 in view of Heilskov '628. Heilskov '708 shows the claimed ladder with the exception of the heat-shrinkable sleeving. Heilskov '628 shows heat-shrinkable sleeving. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the sleeving 25,26 of Heilskov

'708 to be heat shrinkable, as taught by Heilskov '628, to facilitate clamping to his rope rails.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heilskov '708 and Heilskov '628, as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of either the disclosed typical dowel rungs (pg. 5 paragraph (0021) of applicants specification or Elfanbaum. Both the typical rung and Elfanbaum at 10 teach wooden dowel rungs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify to modify Heilskov '708 to comprise wooden dowel rungs, as taught by either the typical rung or Elfanbaum, to enable a cost-effective construction.

Applicant's arguments filed 6/3/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to claim 6, the rungs of Heilskov '628 are platform steps, note page 4 paragraph (0018), of applicant's specification. With respect to applicant's argument that a heat shrunk sleeve would not be able to support the platform of Heilskov '708 such appears to be merely a conclusion and applicant has provide no evidence that a heat shrunk sleeve would not support the weight of such a rung. It is noted that applicant himself contemplates the use of such rungs being held by heat-shrunk sleeves.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alvin C. Chin-Shue whose telephone number is 571-272-6828. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Chilcot can be reached on 571-272-6777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Alvin C. Chin-Shue
Alvin Chin-Shue
Primary Examiner